IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.K.DENESAN

MONDAY, THE 11TH DECEMBER 2006 / 20TH AGRAHAYANA 1928

WP(C).No. 31572 of 2006(H)

PETITIONER:

T.PADMANABHAN,
RTD. HEAD MECHANIC (FCI),
SHINE NIVAS, EMBETE, P.O.PARIYARAM,
KANNUR DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.K.V.KUMARAN

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. REGIONAL MANAGER (SOUTH ZONE),
FCI REGIONAL OFFICE, CHENNAI.

2. GENERAL MANAGER (KERALA),
FCI REGIONAL OFFICE, TRIVANDRUM.

3. AREA MANAGER,
FCI DISTRICT OFFICE, MUZHAPPILANGAD,
KANNUR DISTRICT.

BY SC SHRI. V.P. SEEMANDHINI

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 11/12/2006, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

K.K. DENESAN, J.

= = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =
W.P.(C)No. 31572 OF 2006 H
= = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =

Dated this the 11th December, 2006

J U D G M E N T

The very foundation for the reliefs prayed for is the judgment in O.P. No. 16882/2000 which was affirmed by the Division Bench as per Ext. P1 judgment.

2. The attempt of the petitioner is to get orders in this writ petition directing the respondents to implement Ext. P1 judgment. I am not able to appreciate the course of action chosen by the petitioner. If the petitioner feels that the respondents have not complied with the directions in Ext. P1 or in the judgment in O.P. 16882/2000, the remedy is not a fresh writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution.

3. Without prejudice to the right of the petitioner to seek appropriate remedy, this writ petition is dismissed.

K.K. DENESAN
JUDGE

jan/